



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/643,365	08/19/2003	Raymond Guimont	6579-99-1	4827

7590 06/08/2005

Richard R Michaud
The Michaud-Duffy Group LLP
306 Industrial Park Road
Suite 206
Middletown, CT 06457

EXAMINER

CHOI, STEPHEN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3724

DATE MAILED: 06/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

nm

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/643,365	GUIMONT, RAYMOND	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Stephen Choi	3724	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 April 2005.
 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 11 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 15 and 16 is/are rejected.
 7) ☒ Claim(s) 5-10, 12-14, 17 and 18 is/are objected to.
 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 August 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
 * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: There is no support in the specification for the claimed at least two reservoirs. The phrase "at least" has no upper limit, however, the specification and the drawings do not disclose embodiments having more than two reservoirs. (see MPEP 2163.05 (III) *In re Wertheim*).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-4 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schauble (US 4,809,432) in view of McNeely et al. (US 2004/0109793).

Schauble discloses the invention substantially as claimed including a razor head having at least one blade (14), a shaving aid delivery system including a framework with a supply of at least one shaving aid fluid including a first substrate (66), a second substrate (36), and a third substrate (12) connected together in a stacked array wherein a fluid circuit between the first substrate and the second substrate (Figure 2), a plurality of outlet ports (at 48, 50, 52, 54), and a transport system (30). Schauble fails to disclose a microfluidic circuit. McNeely teaches the use of a microfluidic circuit is old

Art Unit: 3724

and well known in the fluid control art for providing a fluid control circuit in microscale. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of Schauble with a microfluidic circuit as taught by McNeely in order to provide microchannels for consistently and evenly deliver shaving aid. Regarding claim 15, 12.

4. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schauble in view of McNeely as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Prochaska (US 6,473,970)

The modified device of Schauble discloses the invention substantially as claimed except for the shaving aid selected from the group as claimed. However, Prochaska teaches the use of polyethylene oxide, aloe, or vitamin E as a shaving aid is well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ a shaving aid as taught by Prochaska on the modified device of Schauble as a shaving emollient.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 5-10, 12-14, and 17-18 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments, see page 7, lines 3-12, filed 04 April 2005, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1 under 102(b) have been fully considered and are

Art Unit: 3724

persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Schauble and McNeely.

Conclusion


7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Cherif Cheikh.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen Choi whose telephone number is 571-272-4504. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:00-3:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Allan Shoap can be reached on 571-272-4514. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

sc
2 June 2005


STEPHEN CHOI
PRIMARY EXAMINER